

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 3, 4, and 6 contain allowable subject matter.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-6 were pending in this application. By way of this reply, claims 1 and 2 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 3-6 are now pending in this application. Each of the claims 3-6 is independent.

**Claim Amendments**

By way of this reply, claims 1 and 2 have been amended without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 3-6 have been amended into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. With respect to claim 6, the limitations of the intervening claim 5 have also been incorporated. Further, a minor error appearing due to translation has been corrected. Specifically, the term “two faces approximately perpendicular to *a resin molding body*” originally recited in canceled claim 1 has been replaced with the term “two faces approximately perpendicular to *one another*.” Support for the amendments to correct the error due to translation may also be found in, for example, Figure 7 of the published application. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Further, claim 5 has been amended to include a further limitation, "wherein said hollow comprises an inclining face formed in parallel with said total reflecting face." Support for the amendment may be found in, for example, paragraph [0043] of the published application. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

### **Objections**

#### Specification

The abstract is objected to because it is not a single paragraph as written. By way of this reply, the abstract has been amended to be a single paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

#### Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to designate Figure 1 with a legend such as "Prior Art" because only that which is old is illustrated. The drawings have been amended in this reply in view of this objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 3, 4, and 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed above, claims 3 and 4 have been amended into independent forms including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. Claim 6 has also

been amended into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1 and the intervening claim 5. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,965,995 (“Shafaat”). As discussed above, by way of this reply, claims 1 and 2 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, with regard to claims 1 and 2, this objection is now moot. With regard to claim 5, as discussed above, claim 5 has been amended to clarify the claimed invention. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to claim 5 as amended, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention is directed to an optical path converting type optical coupling element, in which two faces approximately perpendicular to one another and a total reflecting face approximately having an angle of 45° with respect to the two faces are formed, and a hollow is formed in a portion of the resin molding body on the side opposed to the total reflecting face. Further, the hollow comprises an inclining face formed in parallel with the total reflecting face. One advantage of the claimed invention is characteristics for reducing shrink cavities on the inner surface of the hollow and the total reflection face. The feature of the inclining face of the hollow and the total reflecting face, in which the two faces are formed in parallel with each other, relates to the shape of the optical coupling element, and actually contributes to the advantage of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, amended claim 5 requires, in part, “*wherein said hollow comprises an inclining face formed in parallel with said total reflecting face.*”

In contrast, Shafaat discloses an arrangement for optical communication including an optical coupler 70. The optical coupler 70 has an optical surface 102 facing a total internal reflection surface 76 (See, Figure 7C of Shafaat). However, unlike the claimed invention, in Shafaat, the optical surface 102 does *not comprise any face that is formed in parallel with* the total internal reflection surface 76. In fact, with regard to the shape of the optical coupler 70 shown in Shafaat, the relationship between the optical surface 102 and the total internal reflection surface 76 can never contribute to reducing shrink cavities on the optical surface 102 and the total internal reflection surface 76.

In view of the above, claim 5, as amended, is patentable over Shaffat, because Shafaat fails to show or suggest at least the above-discussed feature, “*wherein said hollow comprises an inclining face formed in parallel with said total reflecting face.*” Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 15115/180001).

Dated: November 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Thomas K. Scherer  
Registration No.: 45,079  
OSHA - LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant